

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 were rejected by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008. Claims 1, 13 and 16 are hereby amended. Claims 19 and 20 are newly added. The amendments and new claims are fully supported by Applicants' specification and no new subject matter has been introduced. Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks that follow.

Applicant Initiated Examiner Interview

On June 12, 2008, an interview was conducted telephonically between Applicants' representative, Nathan Elder, and Examiner Wilson W. Tsui. During the interview, the prior art references cited by the Examiner in the Office action mailed April 2, 2008 were discussed, as was Applicants' claim 1. Although no agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims, Examiner Tsui indicated that an amendment to the claims, such as the amendment made herein, would likely overcome the claim rejections of the Office Action and advance prosecution of the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of various combinations of cited references. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are not obvious and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18

In the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of a reference referred to as Sheshadri, "Understanding JavaServer Pages Model 2 architecture" (hereinafter "Sheshadri"), U.S. Patent

No. 6,654,932 to Bahrs (hereinafter “Bahrs”) and a reference referred to as Leech, (4Guys FromRolla.com, December 1, 1999, pages 1-5) (hereinafter, “Leech”). For a claim to be obvious in view of a combination of references, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed or suggested by at least one of the references. Applicants submit claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18, as amended, are not obvious in view of Sheshadri, Bahrs and Leech for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, states:

1. A computer program product, tangibly embodied in a machine-readable storage device, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising:
 - providing a server-side framework to an application, the server-side framework being external to the application, the framework supporting predefined data types, each data type having a predefined rule;
 - receiving from an application a request for an object, the request indicating one of the multiple predefined data types, the object storing a default value of the indicated data type, the default value being stored in the object in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format;
 - creating the object in response to the request;
 - generating a markup language page that includes the default value in the transfer format read from the object;
 - sending the markup language page to a browser on a client;
 - receiving a user-supplied value in the transfer format from the browser;
 - replacing in the object the default value in the transfer format with the user-supplied value in the transfer format, the object automatically converting the user-supplied value from the transfer format to the process format, the object storing the user-supplied value in the process format, the object automatically checking the compliance of the user-supplied value in the process format with the predefined rule; and
 - if the user-supplied value in the process format complies with the predefined rule, forwarding the user-supplied value in the process format from the object to the application and otherwise

automatically resending the markup language page to the browser with the user-supplied value in the transfer format.

(Claim 1, emphasis added). Claim 1 refers to “receiving a request for an object ... storing a default value ... in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format.” In addition, claim 1 refers to “replacing ... the default value in the transfer format with [a] user-supplied value in the transfer format [and] automatically converting the user-supplied value from the transfer format to the process format, the object storing the user-supplied value in the process format, the object automatically checking the compliance of the user-supplied value in the process format with the predefined rule.” These claim features are not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references. As such, a combination of the references does not render claim 1 obvious.

Generally, Sheshadri provides a brief introduction to the JavaServer Pages Model 2 architecture. However, Sheshadri does not disclose or suggest “an object ... storing a default value ... in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format” as is claimed in claim 1. Instead, Sheshadri refers to an object (e.g., class CD, on page 8), which has individual fields declared in only one format. For instance, a field or variable for “price” is declared as type “float”. However, the CD object does not have a second field or variable for storing the price in a second format. As such, the CD object of Sheshadri does not store a value in a transfer format and a process format, where the process format is different from the transfer format. More specifically, Sheshadri does not disclose or suggest “an object ... storing a default value ... in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format” as is claimed in claim 1. Moreover, Sheshadri does not disclose or suggest “replacing in the object [a] default value in the transfer format with [a] user-supplied value in the transfer format, the object automatically converting the user-supplied value from the transfer format to the process format, [and] storing the user-supplied value in the process format [within the object], [and] the object automatically checking the compliance of the user-supplied value in the process format with [a] predefined rule”, as is claimed in claim 1.

Leech generally relates to a technique for performing form data validation on the server side. Accordingly, Leech states:

When the user submits the form, the validation script page is run. If the user fails the validation routine, we kick him back to the form page where we'll print out a table of his errors, so he knows exactly what to fix.

According to Leech, a validation script for validating data is stored as a separate page. However, Leech does not disclose or suggest "an object ... storing a default value ... in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format". Moreover, Leech does not disclose or suggest, replacing in the object [a] default value in the transfer format with [a] user-supplied value in the transfer format, [and] automatically converting the user-supplied value from the transfer format to the process format, [and] storing the user-supplied value in the process format [within the object], [and] the object automatically checking the compliance of the user-supplied value in the process format with [a] predefined rule", as is claimed in claim 1.

Bahrs refers to a technique for validating data within container objects handled by a view controller. As such, Bahrs refers to a technique for validating data on the client side. Consequently, Bahr does not disclose or suggest "an object ... storing a default value ... in a transfer format and in a process format, the process format being different from the transfer format". Moreover, Bahrs does not disclose or suggest, replacing in the object [a] default value in the transfer format with [a] user-supplied value in the transfer format, [and] automatically converting the user-supplied value from the transfer format to the process format, [and] storing the user-supplied value in the process format [within the object], [and] the object automatically checking the compliance of the user-supplied value in the process format with [a] predefined rule", as is claimed in claim 1.

As none of the references disclose or suggest the claim features set forth above, claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Sheshadri, Leech and Bahr. Independent claims 13 and 16 include similar features, and are therefore not obvious for the same reasons. Similarly, dependent claims 2-6, 9-12, 15 and 17-20 include all of the features of the base claims from which they depend, and are therefore not obvious for the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 7

In the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Sheshadri, Bahrs, Leech and U.S. Patent No. 6,981,215 to Lindhorst et al (hereinafter “Lindhorst”). For a claim to be obvious in view of a combination of references, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed or suggested by at least one of the references. Because claim 7 is dependent upon claim 1, claim 7 includes all of the claim features recited in claim 1. Because Lindhorst does not disclose those claim features of claim 1 set forth above, Applicants submit claim 7 is not obvious in view Sheshadri, Bahrs, Leech and Lindhorst for the same reasons that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Sheshadri, Bahrs and Leech.

Claim 8, 14 and 17

In the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,356 to Sheard et al. (hereinafter, “Sheard”), “Pure Java Pages” (hereinafter, “Goodwill”), Leech, and U.S. Patent No. 6,331,187 to Jeyaraman (hereinafter, “Jeyaraman”). For a claim to be obvious in view of a combination of references, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed or suggested by at least one of the references. Because claims 8, 14 and 17 are dependent upon claims 1, 13 and 16 respectively, claims 8, 14 and 17 include all of the claim features recited in claims 1, 13 and 16 respectively. Because Sheard, Goodwill and Jeyaraman do not disclose those claim features of claims 1, 13 and 16 set forth above, Applicants submit claims 8, 14 and 17 are not obvious in view Sheard, Goodwill, Leech and Jeyaraman for the same reasons that claim 1, 13 and 16 are not obvious in view of Sheshadri, Bahrs and Leech.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 408-244-1913.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan P. Elder, Reg#55150/

Nathan P. Elder
Reg. No. 55,150

FOUNTAINHEAD LAW GROUP P.C.
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 509
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: 408-244-6319
NPE